

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-20 have been canceled and new claims 21-28 have been added. Support for new claims 21-28 can be found in paragraphs 24-28 of the specification and in the Figures. No new matter has been added.

#### **Drawing Objection**

The Examiner objected to the drawings for including reference 16' that was not mentioned in the specification. The specification has been amended to include the reference numeral 16'. No new matter has been added.

The Applicants note that in the original drawings reference numeral 16 is used to define an opening of a real wiper arm (10). Reference number 16' defines an opening of a simulated model (12) of the wiper arm (10). The utilization of the numbers 16 and 16' is consistent with Applicants' use of the numbers 14 and 14'.

#### **Claim Rejections**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-6, 9, 12-15, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,360,272 ("Kota"). Also, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Kota in view of Tworzydlo et al. "Knowledge-Based Methods and Smart Algorithms in Computational Mechanics ("Tworzydlo").

Claims 1-20 have been canceled, thus obviating these rejections. Applicants believe that new claims 21-28 meet the requirements of Sections 101 and 112. New claims 21-28 are also directed to subject matter that is not taught or suggested in either Kota or Tworzydlo. Although it is unnecessary to discuss the previous rejection because all the rejected claims are canceled, in interest of furthering prosecution, Applicants note the following with respect to cited art and the new claims.

Kota discloses a compliant windshield wiper system based on a detailed finite element model to define a distribution of an input force in a compliant structure (400) of the windshield wiper system. The compliant structure (400) is analyzed with regard to a design which is optimized to distribute input forces of a wiper arm to a same quantity in each leg of the compliant structure (400).

Kota does not teach or suggest, among other things, that a deformation of a wiper arm itself is simulated. Rather, Kota teaches that the compliant structure (400) carried by the wiper arm is analyzed with the help of a finite element method. Kota also does not teach or suggest that a virtual blank form of the wiper arm itself is determined based on assumed parameters of a simulation of the deformation of the wiper arm.

For at least these reasons, Kota does not teach or suggest each and every element of new claims 21-28.

Tworzydlo does not cure the deficiencies of Kota. Tworzydlo discloses a method of designing a compliant mechanism to establish a kinematically-functional design that generates a desired output motion when subjected to prescribed input forces. Tworzydlo does not teach or suggest, among other things, simulation of a blank form of a wiper arm to optimize the wiper arm in regard to aerodynamic properties.


For at least these reasons, Kota and Tworzydlo, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of new claims 21-28.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the present Amendment and allowance of claims 21-28.

If additional consultation will further prosecution, the undersigned is available during normal business hours at the below-identified telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Julianne M. Cozad Smith  
Reg. No. 62,174

Docket No. 022862-1067-00  
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP  
100 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Suite 3300  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108  
414.271.6560

T:\CLIENTA\022862\1067\A3137872.1067